

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 26 and 29. These sheets, which include Figs. 26 and 29, replace the original sheets including Figs. 26 and 29.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 7 and 13-18 have been amended to further clarify the invention. Claims 19 and 20 have been newly added.

The disclosure has been objected to due to a number of blanks in the specification. The specification has been amended to include the US Patent Application Serial Numbers in place of the blanks as well as to correct minor typographical errors. A substitute specification has been included.

Figure 26 has been amended due to typographical errors. Namely, the labels on the lines coming out of step 2608 were reversed. They have been corrected, with the “n” label being on the line running from step 2608 to step 2612 and the “y” label being on the line running from step 2608 to step 2610.

Figure 29 has been amended due to a typographical error. The I/O Device label has been corrected to be item number 2980.

## Double Patenting

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-15 and 17-18 have been rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 10 of US Patent No. 7177329, hereinafter Patent ‘329. However, neither claim 1 nor claim 10 of Patent ‘329 disclose the auxiliary channel periodically sending a status check of the multimedia display device to the multimedia source device. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the claims of this application are patentably distinct from claims 1 and 10 of Patent ‘329.

Claims 4, 10 and 16 have been rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of Patent ‘329 in view of US 2004/0080515, hereinafter Hagiwara. This rejection relies on the contention that claim 1 of Patent ‘329 discloses all elements of the parent claims from which these claims depend. As discussed above, it is

respectfully submitted that that is not the case. The Office Action has failed to point out anything in Hagiwara that could possibly cure the deficiencies discussed above. Therefore it is respectfully submitted that claims 4, 10 and 16 are patentably distinct from the claim 1 of Patent '329 in view of Hagiwara for at least the reasons given above for the claims from which they depend.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 USC §101

Claims 13-18 have been rejected under 35 USC 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 13-18 have been amended to include a non-transitory computer readable medium. It is respectfully submitted that claims 13-18, as amended, are directed to statutory subject matter.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-15 and 17-18 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6914637 B1, hereinafter Wolf, in view of US 2001/0030649, hereinafter Mamiya.

Wolf discloses a communication system for transmitting data from a source device to a sink device. The system has a DDC channel running between a microcontroller in the source device and an EDID ROM in the sink device. The EDID ROM stores status and configuration bits which can be read by the microcontroller over the DDC channel (column 12, lines 46-52). The DDC channel is used by the microcontroller of the source device to query that status of the sink device during test mode operations (column 50, lines 14-60). It is important to note that the source device is required to request the status information stored in the sink device and that the status information request occurs during a test mode of operation, not periodically during normal operation of the system.

In contrast, claim 1 recites where the bi-directional auxiliary channel is arranged to provide a number of support functions such as periodically sending a status check of the multimedia display device to the multimedia source device. It is important to note that the auxiliary channel of the inventive display interface is providing the status check. The source device is not required to request any status information. Additionally, the status check is provided periodically during normal operations rather than during a test mode operation as disclosed by Wolf. The Office Action has failed to point out anything in Mamiya that could possibly cure the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Wolf.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentably distinct from the cited references alone or in any proper combination. Independent claims 7 and 13 recite similar limitations to those discussed above in relation to claim 1. As such, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 7 and 13 are patentably distinct from the cited references alone or in any proper combination for at least the same reasons as given above with respect to claim 1. Dependent claims 2-3, 5-6, 8-9, 11-12, 14-15 and 17-18 depend directly or indirectly from the independent claims 1, 7 and 13 and are therefore respectfully submitted to be patentably distinct from the cited references for at least the same reasons as given for the independent claims from which they ultimately depend.

Claims 4, 10 and 16 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolf and Mamiya as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Hagiwara.

This rejection relies on the contention that Wolf in view of Mamiya discloses all elements of the parent claims from which these claims depend. As discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that that is not the case. The Office Action has failed to point out anything in Hagiwara that could possibly cure the deficiencies discussed above. Therefore it is respectfully submitted that claims 4, 10 and 16 are patentably distinct from the cited references alone or in

any proper combination for at least the reasons given above for the claims from which they depend.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are allowable. Should the Examiner believe that a further telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER LAW GROUP LLP

/Barrie J. Rody/  
Barrie J. Rody  
Reg. No. 66,773

P.O. Box 1687  
Cupertino, CA 95015-1587  
(408) 255-8001